

APR 11 2007

Application No.: 09/933,956

8

Docket No.: 324212009600

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 30, 32 and 33 were previously under consideration, while claims 15-25 were withdrawn. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 30, 32 and 33 were rejected. By virtue of this response, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 30, 32 and 33 are cancelled, no claims are amended, and new claims 34-42 are added. Accordingly, claims 32-42 are currently under consideration. Amendment of subject matter is not to be construed as an abandonment of any subject matter. No new matter is added by virtue of these amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ladd et al (U.S. Patent: 6,269,336).

Procedurally, claims 30 and 33 were cancelled in favor of new claims 34-42, which pursue aspects related to claim 33. As the claims relate to aspects related to previously examined claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims should not require further searching, and entry of these amendments would be appropriate.

Aspects of the claims as added are discussed with respect to the rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al (U.S. Patent: 6,269,336) in view of Saylor et al (U.S. Patent: 6,501,832).

As described above, claims 34-42 were added as a substitute for amending the above-referenced claims in order to pursue the subject matter of claim 33. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not obvious over Ladd in view of Saylor, because Saylor does not disclose the limitations of the claims that Ladd does not disclose. In particular, neither Ladd nor Saylor disclose a prompt mapping configuration comprising a plurality of prompt classes, a plurality of occurrences of a plurality of text strings, where each of the occurrences of each text string is associated with a

sf-2287562

Application No.: 09/933,956

9

Docket No.: 324212009600

prompt class different from the other occurrences of that text string, and a one-to-one association between each of the occurrences and a different one of the audio segment identifiers. Also, neither Ladd nor Saylor discloses a prompt audio object configured to receive contextual information about a browsing session and use that contextual information to determine a prompt class in which to match the received text string to a text string occurrence. Focusing on a portion of the claim, differently stated, Applicants submit that neither Ladd nor Saylor discloses a group of prompts, divided into a plurality of classes, where a search for a particular prompt based on a text string occurs within a class of the prompts, where that class is selected based on contextual information.

New claim 36 proceeds similarly, in that an audio segment is identified by searching within a class of audio segments that is identified using contextual information. Applicants submit that neither Ladd nor Saylor operates according to such a method.

New claims 39 is directed to a computer readable medium that stores instructions for a method according to claim 36. Claim 42 is also directed to a computer readable medium that stores instructions for a method.

Claim 42 relates to a markup language document comprising context indicating elements, which can be used to provide contextual information for identifying a subset of utterances in which to search for an utterance that maps to an identified text string. As such, claim 42 benefits from the discussion above in that neither Ladd nor Saylor disclose searching with a subset of utterances for an utterance mapping to an identified text string, where that subset is selected based on browser contextual information.

Claims 2, 10-11, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al (U.S. Patent: 6,269,336) in view of Saylor et al and further in view of Uppaluru (U.S. Patent: 5,915,001).

As described above, claims 34-42 were added as a substitute for amending the above-referenced claims in order to pursue the subject matter of claim 33 in a manner that distinguishes Ladd. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presently presented are not obvious over

af-2287562

Application No.: 09/933,956

10

Docket No.: 324212009600

Ladd in view of Saylor further in view of Uppaluru, because these references are not alleged to disclose the limitations of the claims that Ladd does not disclose.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al (U.S. Patent: 6,269,336) in view of Saylor et al and further in view of Woods et al (U.S. Patent: 6,510,417).

As described above, claims 34-42 were added as a substitute for amending the above-referenced claims in order to pursue the subject matter of claim 33 in a manner that distinguishes Ladd. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presently presented are not obvious over Ladd in view of Saylor in further view of Woods, because these references are not alleged to disclose the limitations of the claims that Ladd does not disclose. Therefore, Applicants submit that this combination of references does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claims 34-42.

sf-2287562

APR. 11. 2007 2:33PM

MOFO 28TH FL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 849 P. 13

APR 11 2007

Application No.: 09/933,956

11

Docket No.: 324212009600

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **03-1952** referencing docket no. **324212009600**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: April 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael S. Garrabrants

Registration No.: 51,230

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: (415) 268-6824
Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

sf-2287562